

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II are unrelated under M.P.E.P. §806.04 and §808.01 and that the different inventions have different modes of operations, different functions or different effects.

However, it can be seen that the inventions of Groups I and II are related in that the process of Group II relates to the same catalyst used in the process of Group I, since the claim of Group II specifically refers to Claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that the claims of Groups I and II are, in fact, related and it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Further, Applicants traverse the restriction requirement on the grounds that the Patent and Trademark Office has not shown that a burden exists in searching all of the claims. Applicants respectfully pointed out that thousands of U.S. patents have issued in which many more than two subclasses have been searched, and the Patent and Trademark Office cannot reasonably assert that a burden exists in searching only two subclasses.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the restriction requirement. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
REM/rac



Roland E. Martin
Registration No. 48,082